

the Office of Special Counsel, and the Senate legal counsel. In addition, she helped conduct witness interviews, drafted and reviewed chapters of the committee's report, and provided crucial legal advice on the committee's constitutional and Senate procedural authorities.

Vanessa was also responsible for overseeing the FBI and helping to actualize my policy objectives relative to the Bureau and the Nation's broader counterintelligence enterprise. Vanessa brought a keen mind, exacting questions, and a heartfelt passion for the role of the committee in keeping this Nation secure to work with her every day.

Vanessa's professional experience prior to joining the committee staff includes time as a litigation associate at the Drinker, Biddle & Reath law firm branch in Chicago, and as an Honors Attorney in the National Security Agency's Office of General Counsel. Vanessa is leaving the committee staff to work for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, where she will serve as a special advisor to the DNI. I can most assuredly say that our loss is Director Haines' gain. Vanessa will achieve incredible things at the ODNI, and it is to the country's benefit that her contributions to work with this intelligence community will continue. Although I am hopeful the transition will afford her more time with her husband Gary and son George and baby girl Margaux, anyone who has ever met Vanessa will tell you that she is not really the relax-at-home type. I suspect she will bring the same intensity and "let's get this done" attitude that she was known for on the committee into her role at the DNI.

Therefore, it is with a little reluctance and a lot of pride that I wish Vanessa well and thank her for all she has done for the committee. Her wit, intellect, boundless energy, and unparalleled mastery of the culinary arts will be impossible to replace.

Thank you, Vanessa. The vital investigative work of this committee would not have been accomplished absent your dedication, your clear-minded judgment, and your unwavering moral compass.

TRIBUTE TO NATE ADLER AND NICK BASCIANO

Mr. President, I would be remiss, though, to close my comments about Vanessa's departure from the committee without also acknowledging the departure of two other dedicated staff members. Nate Adler and Nick Basciano, currently serving on the majority staff of the committee, are leaving the committee to pursue the next chapters in their professional lives.

Nick and Nate have been valuable members of the committee staff, working critical portfolios covering, among other things, counterintelligence, foreign influence, and Asia, as well as serving as budget monitors to intelligence Agencies. Their contributions to the committee and its work cannot be overstated, and much cannot be pub-

licly acknowledged. Their dedication to mission and their work ethic was a model for all, and their presence and counsel will be sorely missed.

I wish them and Vanessa all the best in their future endeavors. I know that they are going to do great things, and I look forward to hearing and reading about those future accomplishments.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 336, Paloma Adams-Allen, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Maria Cantwell, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Catherine Cortez Masto, Christopher A. Coons, Ron Wyden, Margaret Wood Hassan, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Elizabeth Warren, Angus S. King, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Paloma Adams-Allen, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 404 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Baldwin	Hassan	Risch
Barrasso	Heinrich	Romney
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeven	Sanders
Booker	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Burr	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Scott (SC)
Capito	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Sullivan
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cornyn	Menendez	Thune
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tillis
Cramer	Moran	Toomey
Crapo	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Fischer	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Graham	Peters	Wicker
Grassley	Portman	Wyden
Hagerty	Reed	Young

NAYS—21

Blackburn	Ernst	Lummis
Boozman	Hawley	Marshall
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Cassidy	Johnson	Rubio
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lujan). On this vote, the yeas are 78 and the nays are 21.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator HAGERTY be able to complete our remarks prior to the scheduled recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF LAUREN J. KING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Lauren King to serve as U.S. District Court judge for the Western District of Washington in the Seattle courthouse.

Ms. King is an immensely talented and experienced practitioner of the law, whom I had the honor of recommending to the President for this position, and I am proud to be advocating for her confirmation here today.

Ms. King currently chairs Foster Garvey's Native American Law Practice Group and has served as a pro tem appellate judge for the Northwest Intertribal Court System since 2013. She has served as a commissioner on the Washington State Gambling Commission and taught Federal Indian law at Seattle University School of Law.

Her qualifications are exemplary, and Ms. King's confirmation will also be a historic one. She is a citizen of the Muscogee Nation, and she would be the first-ever Native American Federal judge in the history of my home State of Washington.

Out of the 890 currently confirmed Federal judges, only 3 are Native American. Ms. King would become the fourth, and she would be the sixth-ever Native American judge in U.S. history.

While this number is still too low, Ms. King's confirmation will be an important step toward making sure the members of the Federal judiciary reflect the diversity of our Nation and have critical experience and insight into the unique relationship between our Federal Government and Native Tribes.

This is especially important in Washington State, which for those who don't know, is home to 29 federally recognized Indian Tribes.

So it is not just important but essential that our Federal judges understand the unique histories and perspectives of Native people and the legal principles that protect and preserve Native American standing under Federal law.

I believe this is a perspective that matters and one that has been missing for far too long. With her experience in the Northwest Intertribal Court System and representing Tribes in private practice, Ms. King has a deep understanding of these principles and the legal issues that Tribes in Washington State face. And she has the support of major Native voices in the space. She has been strongly endorsed by the National Native American Bar Association, the National Congress of American Indians, the Native American Rights Fund, and more.

She has earned the support by being a sharp legal mind and a fair and just arbiter of the law. I firmly believe Ms. King has the experience, knowledge, and perspective required to serve on our Federal judiciary with distinction.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination. We can confirm highly qualified judges, and we can make sure our Federal bench reflects the diversity of the people it serves.

And before I close, I also want to acknowledge the two historic U.S. attorneys for Washington State who were confirmed last week. Nick Brown, of Seattle, is the first Black U.S. attorney for the Western District of Washington, and Vanessa Waldref, of Spokane, is the first U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Washington.

I know that both of these historic appointees have the experience needed to be successful, and I am confident they will work diligently to pursue justice for the people of my home State.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, on August 7, I came to the Senate floor to oppose the expedited passage of what is known as the bipartisan infrastructure bill. I did that for several reasons, including because it was obviously going to be taken hostage and used by Democrats to impose Big Government socialism on America.

In those August 7 remarks, I said:

I am frustrated with this legislation . . . because it is tied to . . . the Democrats' real ambition, which is their multitrillion-dollar march to socialism that they will unveil right after this infrastructure legislation is passed.

Democrats have admitted this . . . is [their] plan.

They previewed phase 1 of this scheme in March, when they spent \$1.9 trillion in the name of COVID relief. Of course, 90 percent of it had nothing to do with COVID. It was really just a payoff to their most loyal political supporters. Sadly, it is now causing the highest inflation . . . in decades . . . [which] is a daily tax on every American who [is buying] goods and services.

I went on to lay out phase 2, the step-by-step plan some Democrats are using

to launch their Big Government socialism fantasy.

Step 1, I said, was to change the conversation to trillions. Make billions look small. Condition the Congress. Condition the media. Condition people.

That has happened.

Step 2, I said, was to tell everyone that the United States needs infrastructure.

That has happened too.

Step 3, I said, was to redefine the term "infrastructure" to include Big Government socialism programs. Really muddy it up so that no one could understand what they were actually talking about.

That has happened.

Step 4, I said, was that when more reasonable Democrats in the Senate balk at some of the more extensive or egregious items, promise them a two-track process: one for hard infrastructure and one for social programs. Confuse the situation even further.

That has happened.

Step 5, I said, was to negotiate as much of the Democrats' socialist wish list as possible into the infrastructure track. Then, put the rest of the wish list into the Big Government socialism wish list bill.

That also has happened.

Step 6, I said, was to pass the bipartisan infrastructure bill through the Senate as quickly as possible. The Trojan horse would then be through the gates.

Unfortunately, that has also happened.

Step 7, I said, was to hold that infrastructure bill hostage in the House of Representatives until everything they couldn't get into the infrastructure bill—meaning the trillions of dollars in Big Government spending programs—also passes the Senate.

That is what we are seeing happening right now, just as I predicted in early August.

Step 8, I said, was for the President to say that he wouldn't sign the infrastructure bill into law if it is not accompanied by trillions of dollars in Big Government socialism programs.

This has also happened.

Step 9, I said, was to get the Big Government socialism part passed by circumventing the filibuster in the Senate. This would require abusing an arcane loophole called reconciliation to pass trillions of dollars in Big Government socialism with only 50 Democrat votes.

Step 10, I said, was to give more moderate Democrats political cover to support the parliamentary trick and Big Government socialism spending. To accomplish this, radical Democrats in the House are threatening to shoot the hostage—the hostage is the infrastructure bill that passed the Senate—a bill that more moderate Democrats more strongly support.

These final two steps have not yet been executed because some Democrats see the peril in following the dangerous instincts of the most extreme elements of their party.

On September 27, the most radical House Democrats, backed by Speaker PELOSI, stated that they were "committed to voting for the infrastructure bill only after [their Big Government socialism bill] is passed."

On September 29, one of the most outspoken of that group made it even clearer, saying:

[S]everal months ago, we had an agreement with . . . everybody else throughout the entire party . . . we will move forward on this \$3.5 trillion. And we will link the [two bills, meaning the bipartisan infrastructure bill] and the [big government socialism bill].

In revealing this, she confirmed that the far left has been manipulating everyone involved in this process.

When I laid out Democrats' plans on the Senate floor back in August, I used the word "abracadabra" to illustrate the sleight of hand Democrats were attempting to pull off, saying that the American people might not even notice—until it is too late—that their wallet has been stolen and their country has been fundamentally changed.

Fortunately, it seems the American people are wising up to the trick. The question I asked at the time—and the question the American people should be thinking about—is this: If all of these policies and all of the spending is so good, why does getting it done require a parliamentary house of mirrors?

The answer to this question is that many Democrats know that the Big Government socialism bill is unpopular; it is bad for the country. Otherwise, the hostage-taking wouldn't be necessary.

This radical dream of Big Government socialism is stalled out at the moment. So, at Speaker PELOSI's direction, President Biden drove up to Capitol Hill on October 1 and, according to one Representative, told House Democrats that in order to get the infrastructure bill done, we have to get this agreement on the Big Government socialism bill through the reconciliation.

According to a House Democrat, the President said that he wanted "both bills to go at the same time" and specifically praised the far-left House Members who were "exuberant," according to a progressive congressional caucus member.

In other words, the far left is in charge, and President Biden embraces that fact. His actions made clear that the infrastructure bill is merely a tool to pass this Big Government socialism legislation. Both must pass or neither will pass. Rather than use his platform to defuse the hostage situation, President Biden is egging on the hostage-taking, and he is demanding Big Government socialism as the ransom.

Following President Biden's meeting with House Democrats, POLITICO quoted a Democratic observer who said:

The fact that the president came to the Hill and whipped against his own bill is the strangest thing I've ever seen.